



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,992	10/16/2003	David C. Coffin	6579-76-1	7459

7590 04/18/2005

Richard R. Michaud
The Michaud-Duffy Group LLP
306 Industrial Park Road
Suite 206
Middletown, CT 06457

EXAMINER

PAYER, HWEI SIU CHOU

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/686,992

Applicant(s)

COFFIN ET AL.

Examiner

Hwei-Siu C. Payer

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 14-16 and 19-23 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-13, 17 and 18 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 24-26 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

The amendment filed on 2-1-2005 has been entered.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-4 and 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, lines 10-11, "the housing associated blade assembly" has no clear antecedent basis.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 12, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,875) in view of Trotta (U.S. Patent No. 5,084,968) and Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,288).

Andrews '875 discloses a wet shaving razor (Fig.s10-11) for bi-directional shaving comprising a handle (202); a housing (201) coupled to the handle (202), the housing (201) including a lower housing member and an upper housing member cooperating to define a cavity (205,206); and first and second blade assemblies (203,204) disposed within the cavity (205,206), each of the first and second blade assemblies (203,204) including at least one blade (220,221,223,224) defining a cutting edge substantially as claimed except for the orientation of the blades, and the blades are not movable into the razor housing in response to shaving forces, and the housing lacks a plurality of channels extending between the longitudinal ends of the blade cartridge.

Specifically, Andrews '875 shows the cutting edge of the at least one blade (220/221) of the first blade assembly (203) facing away from the cutting edge of the at least one blade (223/224) of the second blade assembly (204).

However, it is notoriously old and well known in the art to have the cutting edges of razor blades facing toward each other to permit bi-directional shaving as evidenced by Trotta.

In view of this fact, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time this invention was made to arrange the orientation of Andrews '875 blades in another

orientation such as Trotta's for bi-directional shaving as desired. The modification is obvious since it would only involve substituting one known blade orientation for another for bi-directional shaving.

Andrew '288 shows (Fig.53) razor blades (764,771) movable into the razor housing by means of resilient members (761,762) in response to shaving forces and a blade cartridge housing (160, see Fig.11) comprising a plurality of channels (165,167) between the longitudinal ends thereof for facilitating flushing of shaving debris.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Andrews '875 by having the razor blades movable into the razor housing by means of resilient members and by providing the housing with longitudinally extending channels to facilitate a close shave and flushing of shaving debris, respectively, as taught by Andrews '288.

With respect to claim 18, Andrews '875 teaches (Figs.17-20) releasably coupling the housing to the handle. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify the wet shaving razor of Andrews '875 (Figs.10-11) by releasably coupling the housing (201) to the handle (202).

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,875), Trotta (U.S. Patent No. 5,084,968) and Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,288) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Clark (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,473).

The blade cartridge (201) of Andrews '875 as modified above shows all the claimed structure except the resilient members are not spring wires bowed rearwardly of the blades.

Clark shows (Fig.2) a spring member (20) bowed rearwardly of the blade to provide a restoring force to the blade.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Andrews '875 by having the resilient members bowed rearwardly of the blades to facilitate restoring the blades to their rest position. The modification is obvious since it would only involve selecting one known type of resilient members for another for providing a restoring force to the razor blades.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,875), Trotta (U.S. Patent No. 5,084,968) and Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,288) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Althaus (U.S. Patent No. 5,579,580).

The blade cartridge (201) of Andrews '875 as modified above shows all the claimed structure except it lacks a wire wound along the cutting edges of the blades.

Althaus et al. show a blade cartridge (1) comprising a wire (17) wound along the cutting edges of the blades (8,9,10,11) for preventing skin from extruding between the blades.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Andrews '875 by providing a wire wound along the cutting edges of the blades as taught by Althaus et al. for the intended purposed as set forth.

5. Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,875), Trotta (U.S. Patent No. 5,084,968) and Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,288) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chen (U.S. Patent No. 5,003,694).

The blade cartridge (201) of Andrews '875 as modified above shows all the claimed structure except the housing lacks a plurality of channels extending between the side ends of the blade cartridge.

Chen shows a blade housing comprising a plurality of channels (i.e. the channels defined between adjacent guards 21, see Fig.1) extending between side ends of the housing for facilitating flushing of shaving debris.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Andrews '875 by providing the housing with channels extending between side ends of the housing as taught by Chen for the intended purpose as set forth.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

1: Claims 14-16 and 19-23 are allowed.

2. Claims 24-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Remarks

Applicant's arguments filed 2-1-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues, at page 9 of the amendment, Andrews '875 shows bi-directional shaving devices having blades with cutting edges that generally face outwardly. There is no teaching in the reference for a bi-directional razor having inwardly facing blades as claimed in claim 1.

In response, it is well known in the art to have two razor blades facing each other such that movement of the blade assembly in either of two directions constitute a shaving stroke to permit bi-directional shaving as evidenced by Trotta. Therefore, having the blades of Andrews '875 oriented in a facing direction as claimed for permitting bi-directional shaving would have been obvious to one skilled in the art.

Action Made Final

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Point of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hwei-Siu C. Payer her telephone number is 571-272-4511. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for official communications and 571-273-4511 for proposed amendments.

H Payer
April 14, 2005

H Payer

H Payer
H Payer